

United States Patent and Trademark Office

CINITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 WWW.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/040,142	01/03/2002	Joseph M. Kelly	056516.098181	9378
29540	7590 04/15/2005		EXAM	INER
PITNEY HARDIN LLP 7 TIMES SOUARE		HRUSKOCI, PETER A		
NEW YORK, NY 10036-7311			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1724	

DATE MAILED: 04/15/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		<i>i</i> Σ 1		
	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
	10/040,142	KELLY ET AL.		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Peter A. Hruskoci	1724		
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period way. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tir y within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from , cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. (D) (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status	•			
 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 Section 23 Section 23. 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This 3. 3) Since this application is in condition for alloware closed in accordance with the practice under Exercise. 	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro	osecution as to the merits is		
Disposition of Claims				
 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o 	wn from consideration.			
Application Papers				
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomplicated any not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine	epted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se ion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ejected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 				
Attachment(s)	A) □ I=1== :	(PTO 412)		
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:			

Application/Control Number: 10/040,142

Art Unit: 1724

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McLaughlin et al. in view of Kupczik et al.. McLaughlin et al. disclose (see col. 3 line 46 through col. 4 line 62) a method of treating dredged material substantially as claimed. The claims differ from McLaughlin et al. by reciting a step for subjecting the dredged material to an oxidation process. Kupczik et al. disclose (see col. 3 line 7 through col. 4 line 54) that it is known in the art to add oxidants to a contaminated sediment or silt to aid in oxidizing organic compounds in the sediment or silt. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the method of McLaughlin et al. by utilizing the recited oxidation process in view of the teachings of Kupczik et al., to aid in oxidizing organic compounds in the dredged material. The specific oxidizing agent utilized would have been an obvious matter of process optimization to one skilled in the art, depending on the specific dredged material treated and results desired, absent a sufficient showing of unexpected results.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McLaughlin et al. in view of Kupczik et al. as above, and further in view of Baize. The claim differs from the references as applied above by reciting that the flocculating agent is a polyelectrolyte. Baize disclose (see col. 3 line 9 through col. 4 line 25) that it is known in the art to add a polymer flocculant to a dredged material in combination with oxidizing agents to aid in recovering sludge from the dredged material. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the

Art Unit: 1724

references as applied above by adding a polyelectrolyte flocculating agent in view of the teachings of Baize, to aid in recovering sludge from the dredged material.

Applicants argue that the present invention does not require either physical dissociation of organic contaminants from the dredge material or transfer of organic contaminants into the aqueous phase as in Kupczik et al. It is submitted that this dissociation or transfer is not excluded from the instant claims. Furthermore, it would appear that the addition of additive package 40 to the mixer 50 utilized in the present invention would produce the above noted dissociation and transfer.

Applicants argue that neither does McLaughlin et al. or the present invention require the use of an energy source to physically dissociate the organic contaminants from the dredged material prior to oxidation of the contaminants and dissolution of the oxidated contaminants into the surrounding water as in Kupczik et al. It is submitted that the use of an energy source as disclosed in Kupczik et al. is not excluded from the instant claims.

Applicants allege that the combination of the McLaughlin et al. and Kupczik et al. references is improper because the nature of the problem to be solved does not suggest the desirability of modifying McLaughlin. It is submitted the problem of neutralization of hazardous organics contained within large quantities of dredged material and subsequent formation of a specific product is not recited in the instant claims. Furthermore, applicants have not supplied sufficient factual evidence to support the above allegation.

Applicant's arguments concerning Baize are based on the propriety of the combination of McLaughlin et al. and Kupczik et al.. This combination is deemed properly applied for reasons stated above.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter A. Hruskoci whose telephone number is (571) 272-1160. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 6:30AM-4:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Duane Smith can be reached on (571) 272-1166. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Peter A. Hruskoci Primary Examiner Art Unit 1724 Page 5

4/14/05